

1 Honorable Franklin D. Burgess  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

12 MICHAEL BRANNAN, Individually, as  
13 Administrator of the estate of BARBARA  
14 BRANNAN, deceased, and as Parent and Natural  
Guardian for his minor children STEPHANIE  
15 BRANNAN and RHIANNON BRANNAN,

No. 05-5157 FDB

16 Plaintiffs,  
17 vs.  
18  
19 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER

20  
21 Noted: Monday, June 5, 2006

22 NORTHWEST PERMANENTE, P.C.; KAISER  
23 FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN OF THE  
24 NORTHWEST; MINDY ROTHBARD, M.D.; and  
MIKE G. LIN, M.D.,

25 Defendants.

26 I. RELIEF REQUESTED.

27 Defendants seek a protective order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1) preventing  
28 production of personal and financial documents belonging to defense expert witness, Dr. William  
Brady sought by plaintiffs in their Notice of Deposition to Dr. Brady.

29 BURGESS FITZER, P.S.

30 ATTORNEYS AT LAW

31 1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
32 TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
33 (253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS PERTINENT TO THIS MOTION.

The defendants designated Dr. William Brady as an expert witness on one of the issues in this litigation. On May 12, 2006, the plaintiffs served on defendants a Notice of Deposition of Dr. William J. Brady scheduled for June 26, 2006 at 9:00 a.m. *See* Ex. A to Declaration of Paula T. Olson. Included in the notice was a request that Dr. Brady bring the following documents covering the time period of 2001 to the present:

1. All records reflecting the receipt of fees for services as an expert witness in any criminal or civil litigation;
2. All witness fees received for drafting of expert reports, appearance at depositions and appearance in court in any criminal or civil litigation;
3. Income tax returns for the calendar years 2001 through 2005 which reflect the sources of income reported;
4. All 1099 Forms reflecting the receipt of fees for the performance of duties as an expert witness.

*Id.* Defense counsel immediately advised plaintiffs' counsel of their objections to the scope and content of Dr. Brady's deposition notice pertaining to the requested documents. The parties, through their attorneys, discussed the nature of the defendants' objections, attempting to resolve the matter without court intervention. Their best efforts failed. *See* Olson Decl. For the reasons set forth herein, the defendants object to the production of the above listed documents and seek a protective order preventing their production.

### III. LEGAL MEMORANDUM.

A. *Plaintiffs' requests for production of Dr. Brady's financial information violates the spirit and intent of Rule 26(a)(2).*

The rules of discovery of expert testimony are clearly set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B), including the expert's report, the expert's qualifications, a list of all publications

**BURGESS FITZER, P.S.**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
(253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928

1 authored by the expert in the past ten years, compensation to be paid for the study and testimony,  
 2 and a listing of cases in which the expert has testified in the preceding four years. The defendants  
 3 have provided all of this information regarding Dr. Brady to the plaintiffs. The plaintiffs, however,  
 4 are not satisfied with that. They wish to embark on a fishing expedition into Dr. Brady's personal  
 5 and financial affairs in the hopes of uncovering some impropriety or bias created by his previous  
 6 employment as an expert witness. Not only does the requested information violate Dr. Brady's  
 7 right to privacy, it is beyond what is intended or required by the rules of discovery.

8 Defendants further contend that the plaintiffs' request for the above listed documents is  
 9 oppressive, unduly burdensome, and will subject Dr. Brady to annoyance and embarrassment in  
 10 violation of Rule 26. Therefore, defendants seek a protective order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.  
 11 26(c) and request that Dr. Brady be precluded from producing these documents.

12 The issue of discovery of personal and financial information from expert witnesses has not  
 13 been addressed by the Ninth Circuit and only one district court within the Ninth Circuit has  
 14 published an opinion on the matter. The issue has been decided in the District of Maryland and in  
 15 some state courts, which while not binding on this court, is nonetheless instructive on the approach  
 16 taken in a factually similar situation. None of these decisions allowed the production of personal  
 17 financial documentary information.

18 In *Rogers v. United States Navy*, 223 F.R.D. 553 (S.D. Calif 2004), the plaintiff sought  
 19 similar personal financial information from the defense expert, including income derived from  
 20 forensic work. The district court, relying on *Behler v. Hanlon*, 199 F.R.D. 553 (D.Md.2001) held  
 21 this was "overkill." *Id.* at 535 (emphasis added). The court further held that asking the defense  
 22 expert about the percentages of his forensic practice versus his usual practice, the percentages of  
 23 cases that involve plaintiffs versus defendants, and the percentage of his income that comes from  
 24 forensic work versus his clinical practice was sufficient information from which the jury could assess  
 25 any possible bias. *Id.* at 536-36. The court found that it was not necessary for the expert to

26 BURGESS FITZER, P.S.

27 ATTORNEYS AT LAW

28 1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
 TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
 (253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928

1 produce the specific dollar amounts.

2 The *Behler* decision contains an excellent discussion of the reasons why production of  
3 personal and financial documents from an expert is overkill.

4 While there may be cases in which an expert's gross income, and the specific  
5 amounts thereof earned by providing services as an expert witness, may be  
6 discoverable, this should not be ordered routinely, without a showing, absent here,  
7 why less intrusive financial information would not suffice. Most people are sensitive  
8 about their income, and who knows the details about it. By their very nature, expert  
9 witnesses are knowledgeable of information that is scientific, technical, or  
10 specialized, generally acquired by long, hard study and experience. When asked to  
11 provide expert testimony, they are in a position to request compensation that  
12 matches their qualifications, which can seem shockingly high to those not familiar  
13 with the costs of modern litigation. Moreover, in the post-*Daubert/Kumho Tire*  
14 era, and in light of the Rule 26(a)(2) disclosure requirements and the recent changes  
15 to Rules 702 and 703, counsel increasingly are more selective in who they ask to  
16 be expert witnesses, knowing that they will be subject to the utmost scrutiny. Those  
17 who pass muster likely will be able to command fees commensurate with their skill  
and experience, which may, to a lay member of the jury, appear exorbitant, when  
in fact what was charged is the going rate. Rule 26(a)(2)(B) requires disclosure of  
the compensation received by a retained expert in the particular case at issue, and  
counsel routinely bring this out during cross-examination when questioning an  
opposing expert witness. However, permitting routine disclosure of the expert's  
gross compensation, from all sources--including those unrelated to litigation  
activities--would provide the jury with little information relevant to a fair assessment  
of the expert's credibility, while concomitantly introducing the real possibility of  
creating confusion, distraction and even prejudice. Nor is the trial of a case  
facilitated if a party sponsoring an expert attempts to draw the possible sting of  
expert compensation by attempting to prove that what his or her expert charges is  
within the norm, as this opens the door for collateral issues that could further  
distract the jury.

199 F.R.D. at 561-62. *Accord Marron v. Stromstad*, 123 P.3d 992 (Alaska 2005) (holding that  
the experts' testimony regarding their litigation services and amounts of compensation was  
sufficient); *Elkins v. Syken*, 672 So.2d 517, 522 (Fla. 1996) (endorsing a "reasonable balance  
between a party's need for information concerning an expert witness's potential bias and the  
witness's right to be free from burdensome and intrusive production requests."); *Wroblewski v.  
Lara*, 353 Md. 509, 727 A.2d 930 (1999)(holding that harassment of expert witnesses through  
a wholesale rummaging of their personal and financial records under the guise of seeking  
impeachment evidence will not be permitted).

26 BURGESS FITZER, P.S.  
27 DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER - 4  
S:\WPCASES\4830\PLEADINGS\protective.order.wpd  
28 ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
(253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928

1 The plaintiffs have not made any showing as to why this case warrants production of the  
2 requested information. Although the plaintiffs believe that Dr. Brady testifies primarily for the  
3 defense, they will learn at his deposition that he is often employed by plaintiffs as an expert. The  
4 defendants agree that the plaintiffs can inquire of Dr. Brady the percentage of his practice  
5 comprises forensic work and the percentage of his gross income is derived therefore. Dr. Brady  
6 expects and is prepared to discuss the cases in which he provided expert services within the past  
7 four years, the percentage of his gross income that is derived from forensic services versus his  
8 medical practice, and the percentages of when he provides expert services for plaintiffs versus  
9 defendants. This information will give plaintiff more than sufficient fodder for cross examination and  
10 the jury sufficient information to assess Dr. Brady's possible bias. Requiring more will unnecessarily  
11 invade Dr. Brady's privacy, force the defendants to seek similar information from plaintiffs' experts  
12 thereby extending the trial with completely collateral and unimportant evidence to the primary issues  
13 in the case, and confuse the jury.

### III. CONCLUSION.

15 For the reasons set forth herein, plaintiffs' requests for Dr. William Brady's personal and  
16 financial information is beyond the scope of discovery intended by Rule 26. Dr. Brady's response  
17 to questions pertaining to the percentages of his forensic practice and income provides sufficient  
18 information for the plaintiffs and the jury to assess the potential for any bias. The defendants seek  
19 a protective order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1) preventing the production of the documents  
20 sought by plaintiffs in their Notice of Deposition to Dr. Williams Brady.

21 Dated this 25th day of May 2006.

## BURGESS FITZER, P.S.

Paula T Olson  
PAULA T. OLSON, WSBA#11584  
Of Attorneys for Defendants

BURGESS FITZER, P.S.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
(253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on May 25, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record. I hereby certify that no other parties are to receive notice.

PAULA T. OLSON, WSB No. 11584  
Of Attorneys for Defendants  
BURGESS FITZER, P.S.  
1145 Broadway, Suite 400  
Tacoma, Washington 98402  
Telephone: (253) 572-5324  
Fax: (253) 627-8928  
E-mail: paulao@burgessfitzer.com

BURGESS FITZER, P.S.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1145 BROADWAY STREET, SUITE 400  
TACOMA, WASHINGTON 98402-3584  
(253) 572-5324 FAX (253) 627-8928